

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 21-25, 27-34 and 36-41 are pending. Claims 1-20, 26 and 35 are cancelled. Claims 21 and 33 are currently amended. No admission or representation is made by the present argument other than that explicitly provided herein.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for reconsidering the arguments previously submitted.

Independent claims 21 and 33 have been amended to recite modifying “the respective application icon...to display a preview of a content of the new event.” Claims 26 and 35, which formerly recited this feature, have been accordingly cancelled.

Claims 21-41 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0160817, hereinafter “Salmimaa,” in view of Nokia 9210 Communicator, hereinafter “Nokia.”

In his Response to the Applicant’s previously submitted Arguments, the Examiner alleges that there is no clear indication of what is meant by “small display size” and the Examiner accordingly infers that the mobile terminal of Salmimaa and that of Nokia may be considered by a person skilled in the art to have small displays. With respect, the present application is directed to a wireless communication device having a small display. Examples of such a device include a wireless telephone, as described in paragraph [0003]. The display on such a device is necessarily much smaller than that of a desktop or laptop computer. The display is also smaller than that of the communicator of Nokia. As is apparent on page 2 of Nokia, the communicator has two displays - a small primary exterior display and a larger secondary interior display. To view information on the secondary interior display, the user is required to exert effort in opening the device. This effort is the exact issue discussed by the Applicant in the “Description of the related art” at paragraph [0006]. The Applicant’s claimed subject matter makes a user’s task of viewing information on a small display simple and quick.

In addition, the Applicant submits that the primary exterior display of Nokia should be viewed as similar to the “small display” of the currently pending claims. As is most apparent on page 2 of Nokia, the primary exterior display is separate from the secondary interior display, and has a much smaller display. The teachings of Salmimaa are clearly directed to the secondary interior display and not the primary exterior display, as evidenced by Figure 1 of Salmimaa and contrary to the Examiner’s allegations. Although paragraph [0024] of Salmimaa states “a cellular telephone,” it is listed along with a portable computer, nowhere else does Salmimaa describe a cellular telephone, and the figures clearly show a larger display than would be found on a cellular telephone (for example, compare Figure 1 to the cell phone component shown on page 2 of Nokia). Clearly, although Salmimaa states “a cellular telephone,” a person skilled in the art would understand that such a telephone would need to have a large display like the secondary interior display of Nokia in order to support the teachings of Salmimaa and is different from the exemplary wireless telephone of the present application.

A person skilled in the art would understand that a small display as described in the present application is suitable for a cell phone, in contrast to the large display on a portable computing device. In fact, page 2 of Nokia cited by the Examiner supports this distinction, showing clearly that the primary exterior display, which is the concern of the present application, has a much smaller display than the secondary interior display, which is the concern of Salmimaa. Hence Salmimaa and the secondary interior display of Nokia would not be considered by a person skilled in the art as having “a small display” according to the meaning given to that term by the present application and it is submitted that the Nokia Communicator is relevant in showing that Salmimaa indeed does not teach a small display as presently claimed in the Applicant’s application.

Further, the claims recite “visually modifying the respective application icon...to display a preview of a content of the new event.” The Examiner admits that Salmimaa and Nokia do not teach displaying a preview of a content of the new event. However, in rejection of claims 26 and 35, the Examiner alleges that Hellebust discloses a method for the display of a wireless device to be updated to reflect that a new message has arrived by displaying the actual message (paragraph [0011]) and therefore that it would have been

obvious for a person skilled in the art to modify Salmimaa to include a view of the actual message for an icon when a new message arrives. The Examiner alleges that both Salmimaa and Hellebust receive, filter and display information related to messages received. The Examiner further alleges that a person skilled in the art would be motivated to modify Salmimaa with Hellebust to give Salmimaa the capability to further classify and categorize the received messages and to indicate the number of messages received related to a specific application. The Examiner finally alleges that a person skilled in the art would be motivated to make this modification in order to display the actual message for an icon when a new message arrives in order to display the content of the message rather than just the modification of the icon.

Salmimaa teaches modifying the icons by changing their size, color and location on the display (paragraphs [0013], [0027], [0028]) based on the priority of the message or service associated with the icon. Hellebust is not concerned with modifying an icon in any way, but rather filtering received messages so that a user is only alerted to high priority messages. In Hellebust, icons may be newly displayed as a visual alert that an important message has arrived, but there is no pre-existing icon that is being modified. Rather than modifying pre-existing icons to show relative priorities of the messages associated with the icons, Hellebust simply teaches that an icon or alert may be displayed for high-priority messages, and nothing is displayed for low-priority messages. The user is not provided with a visual cue of relative priorities, and in fact is not even notified of low-priority messages. Although both Salmimaa and Hellebust are concerned with filtering and displaying information related to messages received, the two achieve very different goals - one teaches modifying icons to show relative priorities while the other teaches displaying new icons only for high-priority messages. There, Salmimaa and Hellebust disclose completely different approaches, and a person skilled in the art would not be motivated to apply the teachings of Hellebust to Salmimaa because the two are directed to these different approaches that achieve completely different results.

Even if Salmimaa were combined with Hellebust in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the preview taught by Hellebust, when combined with the icons of Salmimaa, would not be suitable for use on a wireless device having a small display screen within

the meaning given to that term by the present application. As shown in Figure 1 of Salmimaa, information about an icon is displayed in a text box across the screen. That is, the icon itself is not modified, as presently claimed, but rather a text box is appended to the icon. A display of the message itself, as taught by Hellebust, will typically be quite lengthy and result in a large text box. As previously explained, Hellebust does not teach modification of any icons. As such, applying the preview of Hellebust to the text box of Salmimaa would result in a large text box containing the preview that is appended to the icon. Such a text box may be acceptable in a large display, such as that shown in Figure 1 of Salmimaa, however it would be too large for a small display, such as on a cell phone, and would obscure much of the small display. In this regard, even if the teachings of Hellebust were combined with the teachings of Salmimaa in the way suggested by the Examiner, the result would fail to meet the objectives of the presently claimed subject matter. The result of such a combination would be different from the present claim, in which the icon is modified to display a preview and thus keeps the preview space as compact as possible, to accommodate the small display, for example as shown in Figure 8 of the present application. The feature of modifying an icon to display a preview is particularly useful where the device has a small display, as it provides more information while minimizing obstruction of the display.

The Applicant submits it would not be obvious to a person skilled in the art to combine Salmimaa and Nokia with Hellebust. Even if such a combination were attempted, the claimed features of a small display and modifying an icon to display a preview of a content of a new event are not taught or even suggested by Salmimaa, Nokia or Hellebust, whether taken individually or combined. These two features together create a synergism that is not achieved by applying the teachings of Hellebust to that of Salmimaa. As such, the present claims, all of which include these features, are all novel and unobvious over Salmimaa, Nokia and Hellebust.

Favourable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions in connection with the Applicant's submissions, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**OGILVY RENAULT LLP**

Date: January 22, 2009

By:           /cyw/            
Christine Wong  
Registration No. 62,935  
Tel: (416) 216-1874  
Fax: (416) 216-3930

OGILVY RENAULT LLP  
Suite 3800, Royal Bank Plaza, South Tower  
200 Bay Street, P.O. Box 84  
Toronto, ON M5J 2Z4  
Canada